

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF ARKANSAS
CENTRAL DIVISION**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

PLAINTIFF

v.

CASE NO. 4:19-CR-00156-BSM

CHRIS MICHAEL GUIDRY

DEFENDANT

ORDER

Chris Guidry's motions for reconsideration, judicial admission of error, injunctive relief, and for appointment of a special prosecutor [Doc. Nos. 148, 152-153] are denied.

First, the motion to reconsider the order denying his previous motions for reconsideration and to vacate his conviction [Doc. No. 148] is denied because Guidry points to no manifest error of law or fact, no newly discovered evidence, or any other reason why reconsideration is warranted.

Second, the motion for an order recognizing that this legal counsel was ineffective [Doc. No. 152] is denied for the same reasons that his previous ineffective assistance of counsel claim was denied. *See* Doc. No. 80. And his motion for an order recognizing judicial error in the January 26, 2023, sentencing hearing [Doc. No 152] is denied because no error has been identified.

Third, the motion for appointment of a special prosecutor [Doc. Nos. 153] is denied because the Attorney General, not the court, has authority to appoint special counsel. *See* 28 U.S.C. § 543; *see also* 28 CFR § 600.1.

Fourth, the motion for an order regarding his Freedom of Information Act request

[Doc. No. 153] is denied because Guidry has failed to exhaust available administrative remedies.

Fifth, the motion for injunctive relief [Doc. No. 153] is denied because nothing indicates he is entitled to this. *See Winter v. Natural Res. Def. Council, Inc.*, 555 U.S. 7, 22 (2008); *see also United States v. Waite, Inc.*, 480 F. Supp. 1235, 1239–40 (W.D. Pa. 1979) (federal tax lien not released until certificate of release issued). There is no need to conduct an evidentiary hearing because the record conclusively shows that Guidry is not entitled to relief. *See Lipscomb v. United States*, 755 F.2d 689, 691 (8th Cir. 1985).

Finally, no certificate of appealability is issued [Doc. No. 152] because Guidry has failed to make a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2).

IT IS SO ORDERED this 29th day of August, 2025.


UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE